

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion and in view of the present amendment, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 16, 21, 23, and 28 have been amended. Claims 2, 8-9, 15, 18, 22, 24-25, and 32 have been cancelled. Claims 34-35 have been added. Claims 1, 3-5, 10-14, 17, 19-21, 23, 26-31, and 33-35 are pending and under consideration. Claims 6-7 and 16 were previously withdrawn as directed to a non-elected species, but should be considered and allowed upon allowance of their base claims.

Applicants have timely filed a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) along with this Amendment, including the filing fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the finality of any Office action and enter this Amendment for consideration under 37 CFR 1.114.

I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 17-18, 21-25, 28, and 31-33

In the Office Action, at pages 2-11, numbered paragraphs 3-4, claims 1-4, 8-12, 17-18, 21-25, 28, and 31-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Palum (U.S. Patent No. 5,335,091) in view of Keisuke (JP10-062831).

Neither Palum nor Keisuke discusses or suggests “a vibration detection sensor secured to the board that detects an extent of vibration of the image-capturing device” or “a vibration-proofing unit that moves the board and the photographic lens member relative to each other along a direction substantially perpendicular to an optical axis of the photographic lens member in conformance to outputs from the vibration detection sensor and the position detector,” as recited in amended independent claim 1. Neither Palum nor Keisuke even contemplate vibration detection, as taught by the invention of claim 1, much less the reduction of vibration by a vibration-proofing unit according to outputs from a vibration detection sensor and a position detector. Therefore, even if Palum were combined with Keisuke, the invention of amended claim 1 would not result.

Since the combination of Palum and Keisuke does not discuss or suggest “a vibration detection sensor secured to the board that detects an extent of vibration of the image-capturing device” or “a vibration-proofing unit that moves the board and the photographic lens member relative to each other along a direction substantially perpendicular to an optical axis of the

photographic lens member in conformance to outputs from the vibration detection sensor and the position detector,” as recited in amended independent claim 1, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

For similar reasons, it is submitted that the combination of Palum and Keisuke does not discuss or suggest “a vibration detection sensor secured to the board that detects an extent of vibration of the camera” or “a vibration-proofing unit that moves the board and the photographic lens member relative to each other along a direction substantially perpendicular to an optical axis of the photographic lens member in conformance to outputs from the vibration detection sensor and the position detector,” as recited in amended independent claim 21. Likewise, the combination of Palum and Keisuke does not discuss or suggest “detecting an extent of vibration of the image-capturing device with a vibration detection sensor, the vibration detection sensor secured to the board” or “moving the board and the photographic lens member relative to each other along a direction substantially perpendicular to an optical axis of the photographic lens member in conformance to the detected relative position and the detected extent of vibration,” as recited in amended independent claim 28. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 3-4, 10-12, and 17 depend either directly or indirectly from amended independent claim 1, and include all the features of claim 1, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. Therefore, claims 3-4, 10-12, and 17 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim 23 depends either directly or indirectly from amended independent claim 21, and include all the features of claim 21, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. Therefore, claim 23 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of this § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 31 and 33 depend either directly or indirectly from amended independent claim 28, and include all the features of claim 28, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. Therefore, claims 31 and 33 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 8-9, 18, 22, 24-25, and 32 have been cancelled. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim 5

In the Office Action, at pages 11-12, numbered paragraph 5, claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Palum in view of Keisuke and further in view of Nobuhiro (JP07-248522).

Claim 5 depends from amended independent claim 1, which recites “a vibration detection sensor secured to the board that detects an extent of vibration of the image-capturing device” and “a vibration-proofing unit that moves the board and the photographic lens member relative to each other along a direction substantially perpendicular to an optical axis of the photographic lens member in conformance to outputs from the vibration detection sensor and the position detector.” As discussed above, the combination of Palum and Keisuke does not discuss or suggest vibration detection and reduction. Additionally, Nobuhiro does not disclose these claimed features. Nobuhiro does not contemplate vibration reduction that conforms to outputs from a vibration detection sensor and a position detector.

As such, it is submitted that the combination of Palum, Keisuke, and Nobuhiro does not discuss or suggest the invention of amended independent claim 1, and therefore, the combination does not discuss or suggest the invention of claim 5, which depends from claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of this § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 13-14

In the Office Action, at pages 12-14, numbered paragraph 6, claims 13-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Palum in view of Keisuke and further in view of Chigira (U.S. Patent No. 5,831,671).

Claims 13-14 depend from amended independent claim 1, which recites “a vibration detection sensor secured to the board that detects an extent of vibration of the image-capturing device” and “a vibration-proofing unit that moves the board and the photographic lens member relative to each other along a direction substantially perpendicular to an optical axis of the photographic lens member in conformance to outputs from the vibration detection sensor and the position detector.” As discussed above, the combination of Palum and Keisuke does not discuss or suggest vibration detection and reduction. Additionally, Chigira does not disclose these claimed features. Chigira does not contemplate vibration reduction that conforms to outputs from a vibration detection sensor and a position detector.

As such, it is submitted that the combination of Palum, Keisuke, and Chigira does not discuss or suggest the invention of amended independent claim 1, and therefore, the combination does not discuss or suggest the inventions of claims 13 -14, which depend from claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 19, 26, and 29

In the Office Action, at page 14, numbered paragraph 7, claims 19, 26, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Palum in view of Keisuke and further in view of Mizumaki (U.S. Patent No. 6,006,041).

Claims 19, 26, and 29 depend from amended independent claims 1, 21, and 28, respectively, and include all the features of claim 1, 21, and 28, respectively, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. As discussed above, the combination of Palum and Keisuke does not discuss or suggest the vibration detection and reduction features of claims 1, 21, and 28. Additionally, Mizumaki does not disclose these claimed features. Mizumaki does not contemplate vibration detection and vibration reduction that conforms to outputs from a vibration detection sensor and a position detector.

As such, it is submitted that the combination of Palum, Keisuke, and Mizumaki does not discuss or suggest the inventions of amended independent claims 1, 21, and 28, and therefore, the combination does not discuss or suggest the inventions of claims 19, 26, and 28, which depend from claims 1, 21, and 28, respectively. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 20 and 27

In the Office Action, at page 15, numbered paragraph 8, claims 20 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Palum in view of Keisuke, in view of Mizumaki and further in view of Konno (U.S. Patent No. 5,852,749).

Claims 20 and 27 depend from amended independent claims 1 and 21, respectively, and include all the features of claim 1 and 21, respectively, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. As discussed above, the combination of Palum, Keisuke, and Mizumaki does not discuss or suggest the vibration detection and reduction features of claims 1 and 21. Additionally, Konno does not disclose these claimed features. Konno does not contemplate vibration reduction that conforms to outputs from a vibration detection sensor and a position detector.

As such, it is submitted that the combination of Palum, Keisuke, Mizumaki, and Konno does not discuss or suggest the inventions of amended independent claims 1 and 21, and therefore, the combination does not discuss or suggest the inventions of claims 20 and 27, which depend from claims 1 and 21, respectively. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim 30

In the Office Action, at page 16, numbered paragraph 9, claim 30 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Palum in view of Keisuke and further in view of Konno.

Claim 30 depends from amended independent claim 28, which recites “detecting an extent of vibration of the image-capturing device with a vibration detection sensor, the vibration detection sensor secured to the board” and “moving the board and the photographic lens member relative to each other along a direction substantially perpendicular to an optical axis of the photographic lens member in conformance to the detected relative position and the detected extent of vibration.” As discussed above, the combination of Palum and Keisuke does not discuss or suggest vibration detection and reduction. Additionally, Konno does not disclose these claimed features. Konno does not contemplate vibration reduction that conforms to outputs from a vibration detection sensor and a position detector.

As such, it is submitted that the combination of Palum, Keisuke, and Konno does not discuss or suggest the invention of amended independent claim 28, and therefore, the combination does not discuss or suggest the invention of claim 30, which depends from claim 28. Accordingly, withdrawal of this § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

II. New Claims

New claims 34-35 depend either directly or indirectly from amended independent claims 1 and 28, respectively, and include all the features of claims 1 and 28, respectively, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. Therefore, new claims 34-35 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above, and it is submitted that new claims 34-35 are in a condition suitable for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1, 3-5, 10-14, 17, 19-21, 23, 26-31, and 33-35 are pending and under consideration. Claims 6-7 and 16 were previously withdrawn as directed to a non-elected species, but should be considered and allowed upon allowance of their base claims.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: August 7, 2006

By: David M. Pitcher
David M. Pitcher
Registration No. 25,908

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501